

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST-NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/828,331	04/21/2004	Osamu Okumura	038959.02	4236
25944 7	7590 04/05/2006		EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			TON, MINH TOAN T	
	P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			2871	
			DATE MAILED: 04/05/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/828,331	OKUMURA ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
·	Toan Ton	2871
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeared for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLANT WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IDENTIFY TO BE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLANT OF THE MAILING IDENTIFY TO BE STATED THE MAILING IDENTIFY THE MAILING IDENT	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tind d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01/</u> 2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ Th 3)□ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. rance except for formal matters, pr	
Disposition of Claims	•	
4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest is/are allowed. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or are	rawn from consideration. /or election requirement. ner. ccepted or b) □ objected to by the se drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document a. Certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicationity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage
	* .	•
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) \(\sum \) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) \(\sum \) Notice of Informal 6) \(\sum \) Other: \(\sum_{}\).	

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is unclear and indefinite whether "an area having no color filter" (1st occurrence, line 9 of claim 4) is the same or different from "an area having no color filter" (2nd occurrence, line 10). In accordance with the specification and the drawings, it appears that these are two different areas. For examination purposes, the Examiner interpreted the 1st occurrence as "an area having no color filter" and the 2nd occurrence as --an additional area having no color filter--.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shirota et al (US 5948576, IDS).

Shirota discloses liquid crystal display comprising: a first electrode; a second electrode opposing the first electrode; a plurality of dots formed in areas at overlapping portions of the first electrode and the second electrode; and a plurality of color filters (e.g., 17), a color filter being arranged to correspond to each of the plurality of dots, the color filter continuously extending

Application/Control Number: 10/828,331

Art Unit: 2871

beyond the area of each of the plurality of dots (see at least Figures 1-4).

Shirota discloses the display comprising individual dots of the plurality of dots being associated with different color filters which display different colors and the different color filters associated with individual dots not overlapping (see at least Figures 1-4).

Shirota discloses the display comprising the different color filters associated with individual dots contacting one another in an area extending beyond an area of a dot (see at least Figures 1-4).

Shirota discloses the display comprising the different color filters associated with individual dots being arranged so as to be separated from one another (see at least Figures 1-4).

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re*

Application/Control Number: 10/828,331

Art Unit: 2871

Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-11 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 30-31 of copending Application No. 10/995176 (cited in newly-submitted IDS). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both comprise at least similar and overlapping subject matter such as a dot area formed at an overlapping portion of the first electrode and the second electrode, a color filter arranged in a section of the dot area, a layer arranged in another section of the dot area in which no color filter is arranged, the layer being transparent.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Application/Control Number: 10/828,331

Art Unit: 2871

Conclusion

5. Applicant's submission of an information disclosure statement under 37 CFR 1.97(c) with the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(p) on 01/26/06 prompted the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 609.04(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Toan Ton whose telephone number is (571) 272-2303.

Page 6

Application/Control Number: 10/828,331

Art Unit: 2871

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

March 31, 2006

TO ANTONINER